REMARKS

Claims 1-3, and 5-14 are pending. Claim 1 is in independent form. Claims 15-34 were previously withdrawn due to the election of Group I. Claim 1 is amended in this paper, and support for the amendment may be found in the Specification at least in paragraph [0094]. Claim 4 is cancelled, and no claims are added in this paper. Accordingly, all claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully urge for the Examiner to enter Applicants' amendments and to pass this application to issue.

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,317,658 to Vian ("Vian"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites:

    1.   A device management system, comprising:
        a plurality of devices, wherein each said device is adapted to perform a device function, wherein each said device function is associated with an input parameter and an output parameter, wherein each said input parameter includes a range of potential input values, wherein each said output parameter includes a range of potential output values, wherein each said output parameter is determined by and associated with at least one said input parameter;
        a plurality of configuration components, each said configuration component including an input matrix comprising said input values corresponding to said input parameters and <u>a custom feature matrix comprising operating rules</u>, wherein said input values are selected and set from said range of potential input values to result in a desired said output value within said range of potential output values <u>according to said operating rules</u>, wherein said input matrix is created through a software application; and
        <u>a plurality of vehicles</u>, wherein said plurality of vehicles includes a first vehicle type and a second vehicle type, <u>each said vehicle includes a configuration component, and each said custom feature matrix comprises substantially identical operating rules.</u>

(Emphasis added.) Vian fails to teach or suggest at least "a custom feature matrix truth table comprising operating rules" and "wherein said input values are selected and set from said range of potential input values to result in a desired said output value within said range of potential output

values according to said operating rules" as recited by amended independent claim 1. Moreover, Vian in fact teaches away from "a plurality of vehicles, . . . each said vehicle includes a configuration component, and each said custom feature matrix comprises substantially identical operating rules," as further recited by claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, Vian discloses a system where:

> vehicle and control input sensors 78 send system state information to the neural network controller 66. The system states are processed by the control laws function 72 of the neural network controller 66. Based on the control laws, the system states are converted to commands for the moments/forces 75 that are desired to best control the vehicle. (Vian, col. 4, lines 2-10.)

Vian further discloses that a "neural network controller is trained for all possible contingencies for the target, or on-line system." (Vian, col. 2, lines 10-13.) According to the training, "control effector commands that yield feasible control subsystem forces/moments are calculated based on the generated desired forces/moments, operating conditions, and the predefined limits of the control subsystems." (Vian, col. 4, lines 47-51.) Importantly, in Vian, "the predefined compensation and control laws are determined by the nature of the vehicle and the type of vehicle sensors employed." (Vian, col. 4, lines 43-46; emphasis added). Thus, in contrast to "a custom feature matrix comprising operating rules," Vian discloses "calculated" "effector commands" taking into account "the nature of the vehicle," i.e., based on the vehicle itself, not on any "operating rules."

In fact, these predefined compensation and control laws of Vian teach away from claim 1's recitation of "a plurality of vehicles, wherein said plurality of vehicles includes a first vehicle type and a second vehicle type, each said vehicle includes a configuration component, and each said custom feature matrix comprises substantially identical operating rules." In contrast to "substantially identical operating rules" as recited by claim 1, Vian instead discloses "off-line calculations are preferable performed on a computer programmed to simulate the vehicle," such as "an airplane, a helicopter, an ejection seat, a satellite, [or] a watercraft," where, as mentioned above, "the predefined compensation and control laws are determined by the nature of the vehicle and the type of vehicle sensors employed." Thus, Vian's predefined compensation and control laws

represent specific control effector commands <u>tied to a particular vehicle,</u> not "substantially identical operating rules." Accordingly, Vian teaches away from "a plurality of vehicles, . . . each said vehicle includes a configuration component, and each said custom feature matrix comprises substantially identical operating rules," as recited by claim 1.

Similarly, Vian further fails to teach or suggest "wherein said input values are selected and set from said range of potential input values to result in a desired said output value within said range of potential output values according to said operating rules," as recited by independent claim 1. In contrast, in Vian "control effector commands . . . are sent to the control subsystems" in response to "vehicle and control input." (Vian, col.4, lines 1-25.) These commands are not sent according to operating rules, but instead according to pre-computed data. (Vian, col. 4, lines 43-46.)

For at least these reasons, Vian fails to teach or suggest at least "a custom feature matrix comprising operating rules" or "wherein said input values are selected and set from said range of potential input values to result in a desired said output value within said range of potential output values according to said operating rules." Additionally, Vian in fact teaches away from "a plurality of vehicles, . . . each said vehicle includes a configuration component, and each said custom feature matrix comprises substantially identical operating rules" as further recited by claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request for the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, as well as claims 2-3, and 5-14 depending therefrom, to be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Any fees due for this response should be charged to our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 65783-0034 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to this deposit account.

Dated: April 30, 2009   Respectfully submitted,

                                          Electronic signature: /Glenn E. Forbis/
                                          Glenn E. Forbis
                                              Registration No.: 40,610
                                          RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
                                          Correspondence Customer Number: 10291
                                          Attorney for Applicant